

objection, “a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315 (quotation omitted). If a party makes only general objections, de novo review is not required. See Wells v. Shriners Hosp., 109 F.3d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1997). In “order to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection.” Martin v. Duffy, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (quotation omitted); see United States v. Midgette, 478 F.3d 616, 622 (4th Cir. 2007).

The court has reviewed the M&R and the record. The court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record. See Diamond, 416 F.3d at 315. Thus, the court adopts the conclusion in the M&R that the court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction and remands the case to the North Carolina General Court of Justice, Wayne County District Court Division.

In sum, the court GRANTS defendant’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis [D.E. 2], STRIKES the notice of removal, and REMANDS the case to the North Carolina General Court of Justice, Wayne County District Court Division. The clerk shall close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 20 day of July 2021.


JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge